



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

2:9 (The first temptation is directed to the appetite of the body, as afterwards to Jesus' "hunger," to "the lusts of the flesh").

"And that it was a delight to the eyes" (The second temptation is addressed to the lust of the eyes, to the desire for fame. This may well have been the motive of the temptation to the Lord Jesus on the pinnacle of the temple).

"And that the tree was to be desired to make one wise" (The knowledge gained was to make her as God. It is the temptation to ambition, the vain-glory of life, "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," which Satan showed to the Saviour).

"She took of the fruit thereof and did eat" (She preferred the tree of knowledge to the tree of life and holiness, culture to character, knowing to being. Ear, eye, mind and heart captured, the hand unchecked stretches out and takes the fruit. Appetite, taste and ambition combined to produce the first sin. God left sin possible, not necessary; man made it actual. It was not spontaneous, yet it was deliberate and willful. It was not a sin of ignorance or weakness, but open disobedience, transgression and trespass, Rom. 5:14,15,19). "And she gave also unto her husband with her and he did eat" (Deceived, she at once becomes a deceiver, and so sin propagates itself, one victim procuring another. Thus Satan crept into the house and took captive a silly woman, laden with sins, led away by divers lusts. "God tempteth no man; but each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed").

PROFESSORS GARDINER AND BISSELL ON THE PENTATEUCH QUESTION.*

FROM PROFESSOR GARDINER'S ESSAY.

"There remains one other point which is approached with hesitation. To him who looks to our Lord as absolute truth and the Source of divine knowledge, it is not easy to speak of Him only in His human capacity, and to think of the bearing of His words simply as emanating from a sinless man. Yet this task must now be essayed; for, of course, if His heavenly authority be admitted, our whole discussion has been settled in advance. Looking at Him then, only in His human character, what light does His life and teaching throw upon the origin of the religion in which He was born and trained? There is no room for question that He regarded it as divine, for He constantly asserts this, and while He recognizes no other authority upon earth, He always maintains the divine authority of this. Two suppositions have been made to explain His position while denying that it was right. One, that He was so much under the influence of the prejudices and habits of thought in which He had been trained, that He did not Himself see the falsity of their ground; the other, that while He really saw this, He yet did not think it wise to put Himself in conflict with the prevailing opinions and prejudices of his countrymen.

* FROM ESSAYS ON PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM. No. 2 (By Frederic Gardiner, D. D.): "Was the Religion of Israel a Revelation or a merely Human Development?" No. 3 (By E. C. Bissell, D. D.): "Pentateuchal Analysis." New York: *Funk & Wagnalls*.

"In regard to the former, the general sagacity of our Lord must be admitted. He had a deep spiritual insight, and thoroughly understood the needs of the human heart; He was able so far to cast Himself loose from the past as to found that new religion of the future which is still only in the midst of its progress; He was a man of deep reflection, to whose nature all shams and conventional deceptions were utterly abhorrent—a man who sought and taught only pure and absolute truth; He was brought into contact with all the forms in which the religion of His day appeared, and He never failed to pierce and expose, as with an Ithuriel's spear, whatever in it was hollow and untrue. Of all who ever lived, He was the 'man in advance of His time,' who, unshackled by the past, belonged to the future; nay, He was the very embodiment of the future. The supposition that such an one was mistaken as to the essential character of the religion which He gave His life to complete and supercede, is simply incredible. We may set aside the theory of ignorance and prejudice in 'Jesus of Nazareth' in this fundamental matter of His whole life, as a supposition which can have no standing in the court of reason.

"But while He knew better, may He not have judged it wise so to adapt Himself to the prejudices of His countrymen as to avoid stirring up needless opposition to His main work? Certainly his utterances do not have the air of accommodation, but of positive and emphatic teaching. But not to insist on this, what really were the opinions with which He came in contact? Neither the authorities nor the people seem to have been at all occupied with any question as to the original source of the law; that was considered a settled point, the discussion of which was not moved at all. The whole question in which they were interested was of the authority and binding force of those glosses and interpretations by which they had 'made the law of God of none effect.' In defense of these all their narrowness and party rancor was aroused, and to these our Lord showed no consideration or mercy. He thrust them aside, and taught that they were derogatory to His Father, and in contradiction to the law itself. In the matter of the law, then, our Lord did not conform to the prejudices of His countrymen, but from first to last set Himself and His teaching in absolute contradiction to them. It was this that roused their hatred and led, as He clearly foresaw, to His condemnation as a malefactor and to His death upon the cross.

"His view, therefore, of the Mosaic law can be accounted for in neither of these ways. The record of that view is in His almost every utterance. It appears in His devout submission to its requirements as of divine authority; in His reference to its teachings as heavenly truth; in His citation of its statutes as embodying the duty of man, and of its representations of the God of Israel as absolute truth. Even when He enlarges or modifies its precepts, He still shows that His teaching was the original intention of the law, temporarily changed for 'the hardness of men's hearts.' He stood firmly and fully upon the Old Testament in all His promulgation of the New. He ever recognized its authority as absolute and of God, while He admitted no other authority. To Him the 'law, the prophets, and the Psalms' were sacred books, divinely given. He certainly was sufficiently well informed, and had a sufficiently deep insight and sagacity. Is it likely that there was a radical error on this fundamental point in Him who spake 'as never man spake'?"

FROM PROFESSOR BISSELL'S ESSAY.

"At the outset of our inquiries concerning the Pentateuch laws, then, we are

confronted with the fundamental question whether the representation they make that they come 'from Moses and the desert' is probably genuine or belongs simply to their 'literary form of presentment,' as it is alleged. It is certain that there is nothing in the substance of these laws to encourage a theory of deception. The moral plane on which they move is confessedly the highest. Not only is supreme loyalty to Jehovah demanded, but thoroughly upright dealing between man and man. Let there be noted, for example, under what strict rules judges and officers are put in the discharge of their functions (Deut. 16:18-20; 17:8-13); the requirement respecting those testifying in criminal suits (Deut. 17:6; 19:15); the severe punishment visited upon false witnesses (Deut. 19:15-21), and the strenuous insistence on the use of correct weights and measures in business transactions (Deut. 25:13-16). It is too much to suppose, as the theory of Kuenen does, that persons introducing laws of this character would themselves flagrantly sin against them.

"It might be said, however, and is said, that in attaching the name of Moses to the Pentateuch laws there was no fraudulent intention whatever. It was merely a device, openly adopted, just as the Qoheleth of the Book of Ecclesiastes, under a thin and easily penetrable disguise, was represented to be Solomon, in order to heighten the effect of the work. It is by no means easy to accept such an explanation of the matter. It is an hypothesis which surely verges on the incredible to suppose that this could have been so, and no vestige of the fact have been discovered until our day. Besides, what purpose could possibly have been served in David's time or Ezra's time by ascribing a law then, as it is supposed, first required by actual circumstances, and first promulgated, to Moses, who lived centuries before in circumstances entirely diverse? The theme of the Book of Ecclesiastes and its treatment accord, in the main, with the *nom de plume* of the writer. Solomon was a real king, and there is an accepted history of his times and of his personal habits and tastes.

"With Moses it is very different. He lived, as our critics allege, in a rough and cruel age. The narrative we have of him is largely mythical. Few, if any, laws really came from his hand. Nobody can have known this better than his compatriots of the later day. How then could it have enhanced in any sense or degree the authority or worth of a law of theirs to put his name supposititiously upon it? What, for example, should fit him, on the basis of such an estimate of him, to be an ideal legislator for the temple on Mount Moriah, with its complex and splendid ritual? The only thing which would render it either consistent or in the least probable that later legislators would thus refer laws of their own, whether surreptitiously or openly, to the hero of the exodus, would be a prevalent understanding and admission that Moses himself was a divinely guided legislator and that, in its general features, the biblical account of him and his times is true. But this is the exact thing that is called in question, although in so doing our critics fatally undermine their own most fundamental position.

"We have considered the matter from the point of view of common experience and common sense. It appears just as improbable when considered from that of literary criticism. The composition and arrangement of the Pentateuch laws is such that the unlikelihood of their origin in the way our critics fancy closely verges on the impossible. The three codes, it is believed, reflect not only three distinct and widely separated periods, but almost every intervening period. They are a growth in thought, it is said, which began first to take on tangible written

form about the time of the earlier kings of Israel and reached its present completeness at the time of the exile, or, as Kuenen maintains, considerably later than that. During all this time priests and prophets, especially the former, were making new laws supposed to be suitable to the exigences of their own periods, and, in order to give them currency, ascribed them to Moses, or to Moses and Aaron, or to Moses and Eleazer, after the assumed death of Aaron. As a part of the illusion, Moses is made to say that all the commandments, institutions and judgments which he had to teach to Israel he received from Jehovah, on Mount Horeb, and on the 'face of the whole legislation, we read that the theatre is the desert; Israel is encamped there; the settlement of Canaan is in the future.'

"Can we fairly conceive of such a process of law-making as possible? It is kept up for a millennium, the sons doing as the fathers did in this respect for thirty generations. Every new statute coming into being is carefully and most ingeniously given the Mosaic stamp and the coloring of the desert. Or, if this was not done at the time the laws were made, it was done subsequently through the skillful retouching of later editorial hands. It might be asked, Why should it have been done at all, if not at first? If the help of Moses' name was needed, it was needed most when the laws were first promulgated. To attach it to them after they had once come to be known as the work of contemporaneous legislators would have been, one might suppose, an occasion of weakening, more than strengthening, their authority.

"But in the one way or the other this most anomalous method of legislating for a great people, it is affirmed, went on for hundreds of years. Nobody pretends to assert that there has ever appeared any evidence that the people of Israel themselves recognized, as such, the illusion with which they beguiled themselves. Every supposed legislator—there must have been scores of them—keeps himself as carefully out of sight as though he had never existed. The result of the whole is the Pentateuch, a literary composition equally a marvel of moral elevation and intellectual strength—a work that presents a body of laws making just claim to be essentially a unit in conception and teaching, and one that, placed at the beginning of the Bible, has left its indelible mark on every part of it. It is admitted that there are some serious difficulties involved in the common view of the origin and literary structure of the Pentateuch; there are surely none that call for such a stretch of credulity as this.

"But it is pronounced highly improbable that such a body of legislation *could* have originated in the limited period allowed, that is, during the first year after the exodus and the closing months of the fortieth year in the wilderness. Admitting the claim, however, that these laws were, to a large extent, supernaturally given, there need be no improbability attaching to the matter. Even without this postulate, their origin in this limited time, all things considered, is much more credible than the alternative hypothesis. The Bible nowhere states that every specific law arose *de novo* at the period of the exodus. It is exceedingly probable that not a few of those found in the so-called Book of the Covenant represent, either in a written or unwritten form, previous customs of the people under their elders and judges. Israel went down into Egypt as a family under its patriarchal head. It dwelt in Goshen as a distinct, and for a long time, as it would appear, as a *quasi* independent people. It cannot have been without laws of some sort during this time. Whatever laws they may have had they doubtless took back with them to Canaan. In principle, many of them we believe are found

in chs. 21-23 of Exodus. The terse, laconic form in which they appear is entirely in harmony with this supposition; and there is documentary confirmation of it. Before the giving of the law on Sinai Moses is represented as saying to Jethro, his father-in-law: 'The people come unto me to inquire of God . . . and judge between a man and his neighbor, and I make them know the statutes of God, and his laws.'

"Apart from the Book of the Covenant there is the legislation respecting the tabernacle and its worship contained in Exodus—Numbers and the code of Deuteronomy. A remarkable misapprehension seems to exist as to the amount of matter contained in these codes. Possibly the mistake arose from a sense of their unexampled influence upon the institutions of the civilized world. In this respect the Decalogue, which might be written on a five-cent piece, is a tremendous code. But, deep and wide as has been their effect, the actual words of the Pentateuch laws are comparatively few. The first code covers about five pages, or a space of twenty by seven inches, in the Hebrew Bible. The laws of Deuteronomy, we are told, were inscribed on plastered stones after reaching Canaan. Had the character in which they were written been enlarged to five times their size as they now appear in the Hebrew, they could all have been written on a space eight feet by three and would then have required less room by one-half than was allotted to the famous Behistun inscription of the Persian Darius. Compare the amount of new or revised legislation called for in one of the United States in a single year with that of the whole Israelitish nation in a peculiar period of its history and during the space of forty years. Compare further with the same the changes that are often thought necessary in laws, made one year, by a legislature meeting the next or the second year after, under circumstances, to all appearance, quite similar, and one will be surprised not only at the condensed form but the wonderful unity and consistency of the laws of the Pentateuch."

A BIBLICAL CHECK TO BIBLE CHRONOLOGY.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES RUFUS BROWN, PH. D.,

Newton Centre, Mass.

Strictly speaking, there is no biblical chronology; for the biblical writers do not give us a *system* of chronology, but merely detached chronological statements. For convenience, the inferences from what they say, made by different writers and combined in systems of their own, may be called biblical, inasmuch as they purport to be based on biblical passages. It must be remembered, however, that these inferences have no absolute authority for us, and it is an open secret that no scheme has yet been devised which has not contradicted some statements made by the Bible. If learned men have failed to discover a system reconcilable with the Bible and have differed in the inferences they have drawn from it, it becomes a very grave question in our own interpretations of the Bible what to do with a statement involving chronology. One canon is certainly sound. If by an inference from some biblical passage we reach a conclusion which seems on other accounts improbable, positive evidence in the Bible itself against this conclusion will justify us in saying that the inference was wrong. Take a case in point—the